

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

The present invention is different from the prior art of record, including the applied prior art references. The present invention is directed to methods and apparatuses that generate a coded signal from an original coded signal or decode such a generated coded signal. The present invention solves problems associated with the situation where the display order of the generated coded signal is different than the display order of the original coded signal. However, it appears that the Examiner considers that the claims in their previous condition could be broadly read to encompass conventional original coding of a motion picture where the display order is “non-sequential” from the perspective of the encoded stream.

Thus, claims 8, 9, 13, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boon. This rejection is traversed as inapplicable to claims 8, 9, 13, and 15 as amended herein for the following reasons.

Claims 8, 13, and 15 include recitations directed to methods or apparatuses for decoding a coded stream that includes a display order information value for each picture included in the coded stream, and a flag inserted into the coded stream so as to indicate a position among the coded picture data where a sequence of display order information values of the pictures in the coded stream is different from a sequence of display order information values of pictures in an original coded moving picture signal from which the coded stream has been generated. Claims 8, 13, and 15 also include recitations directed to the extraction of “the flag indicating a position among the coded picture data where the sequence of display order information values of the pictures is different from the sequence of display order information values of pictures in the original coded moving picture signal.”

Boon does not disclose or suggest the inventions recited in claims 8, 13, or 15. Boon does not disclose decoding a coded stream that includes a flag inserted into the coded stream so as to indicate a position among the coded picture data where a sequence of display order information values of the pictures in the coded stream is different from a sequence of display order information values of pictures in an original coded moving picture signal from which the coded stream has been

generated, or the extraction of such a flag, as recited in claims 8, 13, and 15. Boon simply does not recognize or deal with any such difference in sequence between an original coded signal and the coded stream that is to be decoded. Rather, Boon merely includes a flag (RA flag), which indicates whether or not compressed image data is suitable for random reproduction.

Accordingly, claims 8, 9, 13, and 15 are not anticipated by Boon under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boon (EP 0971543) in view of Mitsuhashi (US 2002/013898). This rejection is traversed as inapplicable to claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, and 14 as amended herein for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 6, 12, and 14 include recitations directed to the detection of “whether a sequence of display order information values for the pictures to be included in the generated coded stream is different from the sequence of the display order information values of the original coded moving picture signal” and to the generation of “a flag indicating that the sequence of display order information values for the pictures included in the generated coded stream is different from the sequence of display order information values of the original coded moving picture signal.”

Boon does not disclose the inventions recited in claims 1, 6, 8, or 12-15. Boon does not disclose detection of “whether a sequence of display order information values for the pictures to be included in the generated coded stream is different from the sequence of the display order information values of the original coded moving picture signal” or the generation of a flag indicative thereof as recited in claims 1, 6, 12, and 14. Boon simply does not recognize or deal with any such difference in sequence between an original coded signal and the coded stream that is to be generated.

No such situation is at issue in the Boon system. Since all the pictures in the inputted signal are included in the generated signal in Boon, there is no need to detect whether a sequence of display order information values for the pictures to be included in the generated coded stream is different from the sequence of the display order information values of an original coded moving picture signal or to generate a flag indicative thereof as recited in claims 1, 6, 12, and 14. There is no concept in Boon of a separate generated coded stream and an original coded signal. Rather, Boon merely discloses the coding of a motion picture and includes a flag (RA flag), which indicates whether or not compressed image data in the coded stream is suitable for random reproduction.

The Mitsuhashi reference describes that the processing of a B picture is a bi-directional

predictive encoding process that requires an I-picture or a P-picture that has a display time that is later to be processed prior to the B picture. This is essential for encoding a B-picture. In other words, Mitsuhashi merely discloses a technique for solving a problem in encoding in general, whereas the present invention is a technique for solving a problem in encoding a stream where a sequence of display order information values for the pictures to be included in the generated coded stream is different from the sequence of the display order information values of the original coded moving picture signal or to generate a flag indicative thereof. Mitsuhashi simply does not disclose or in any way suggest the flag information recited in the claims of the present application.

In view of the above, it is submitted that no obvious combination of Boon and Mitsuhashi would have resulted in the inventions recited in any of claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, or 14, and such claims would thus not have been considered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boon in view of Mitsuhashi and Teo (US 5,621,464), and claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boon in view of Mitsuhashi, Teo, and Asai (US 6,710,785). These rejections are traversed as inapplicable to the claims as amended herein.

As discussed above, none of Boon, Mitsuhashi, or any obvious combination thereof discloses or suggests decoding a coded stream that includes “a flag inserted into the coded stream so as to indicate a position among the coded picture data where a sequence of display order information values of the pictures in the coded stream is different from a sequence of display order information values of pictures in an original coded moving picture signal from which the coded stream has been generated,” or the extraction of such a flag, which is recited in independent claim 8. Teo does not remedy the lack of disclosure or suggestion by Boon or Mitsuhashi of these features. Therefore, no obvious combination of Boon, Mitsuhashi, and Teo would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited claims 9 or 11, which depend from claim 8. Asai also does not remedy the lack of disclosure or suggestion by Boon and Mitsuhashi of the features recited in claim 8. Therefore, no obvious combination of Boon, Mitsuhashi, Teo, and Asai would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited in claim 10, which ultimately depends from claim 8.

Because of the distinctions discussed above, it is submitted that claims 1, 4, and 6-15 are patentable over the prior art of record and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Youji NOTOYA et al.

/Jeffrey R. Filipek/

By: 2008.11.06 11:02:36 -05'00'

Jeffrey R. Filipek

Registration No. 41,471

Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

November 6, 2008